See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235763451

Reduced Fronto-Temporal and Limbic Connectivity in the 22q11.2 Deletion Syndrome: Vulnerability Markers for Developing Schizophrenia?

Article in PLoS ONE · March 2013



Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

22q11.2 deletion syndrome (syndrome velo-cardio-facial) / Williams syndrome / Down syndrome View project

Psychological mechanisms and psychopathology in incarcerated youths View project

1 Reduced fronto-temporal and limbic connectivity in

2 the 22q11.2 deletion syndrome: Vulnerability

3 markers for developing schizophrenia?

4

Marie-Christine Ottet^{1,2}*, Marie Schaer¹, Leila Cammoun², Maude Schneider¹, Martin Debbané^{1,3}, Jean-Philippe Thiran² and Stephan Eliez^{1,4}.

- 7 1 Office Médico-Pédagogique (OMP), University of Geneva School of Medicine, Geneva, Geneva,
 8 Switzerland
- 9 2 Signal Processing Laboratory (LTS5), Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFL), Lausanne,
 10 Vaud, Switzerland
- 11 *3 Adolescence clinical psychology research unit, University of Geneva, Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland*
- 12 4 Department of Genetic Medicine and Development, University of Geneva School of Medicine,
- 13 Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland 14

15E-mails:marie-christine.ottet@unige.ch,marie.schaer@unige.ch,leila.cammoun@epfl.ch,16maude.schneider@unige.ch,martin.debbane@unige.ch,jean-philippe.thiran@epfl.ch,17stephan.eliez@unige.ch

18

19 Abstract

20 The 22q11.2 deletion syndrome (22q11DS) is a widely recognized genetic model 21 allowing the study of neuroanatomical biomarkers that underlie the risk for 22 developing schizophrenia. Recent advances in magnetic resonance image analyses 23 enable the examination of structural connectivity integrity, scarcely used in the 24 22q11DS field. This framework potentially provides evidence for the disconnectivity hypothesis of schizophrenia in this high-risk population. In the present study, we 25 26 quantify the whole brain white matter connections in 22q11DS using deterministic 27 tractography. Diffusion Tensor Imaging was acquired in 30 affected patients and 30 28 age- and gender-matched healthy participants. The Human Connectome technique 29 was applied to register white matter streamlines with cortical anatomy. The number of 30 fibers (streamlines) was used as a measure of connectivity for comparison between 31 groups at the global, lobar and regional level. All statistics were corrected for age and 32 gender. Results showed a 10% reduction of the total number of fibers in patients compared to controls. After correcting for this global reduction, preserved 33 connectivity was found within the right frontal and right parietal lobes. The relative 34 35 increase in the number of fibers was located mainly in the right hemisphere.

36 Conversely, an excessive reduction of connectivity was observed within and between 37 limbic structures. Finally, a disproportionate reduction was shown at the level of 38 fibers connecting the left fronto-temporal regions. We could therefore speculate that 39 the observed disruption to fronto-temporal connectivity in individuals at risk of 40 schizophrenia implies that fronto-temporal disconnectivity, frequently implicated in 41 the pathogenesis of schizophrenia, could precede the onset of symptoms and, as such, 42 constitutes a biomarker of the vulnerability to develop psychosis. On the contrary, 43 connectivity alterations in the limbic lobe play a role in a wide range of psychiatric 44 disorders and therefore seem to be less specific in defining schizophrenia.

45

46 Keywords and phrases

47 22q11DS, DiGeorge, velo-cardio-facial syndrome, schizophrenia, Human
48 Connectome, tractography, psychosis, connectivity.

49 Introduction

50 Neurogenetic syndromes offer a unique framework to study the interplay between 51 genes, brain and behavior [1]. Among neurogenetic conditions, 22q11.2 deletion 52 syndrome (22q11DS), also known as velo-cardio-facial syndrome, is widely 53 recognized as a genetic model for schizophrenia [2,3]. Indeed, patients affected by 54 22q11DS show a 30% prevalence rate for developing schizophrenia [4], but 75% present milder psychotic symptoms [5]. Therefore, neuroanatomical measurements in 55 56 22q11DS may reveal specific neurodevelopmental pathways [1] and endophenotypic 57 biomarkers for schizophrenia [6].

58

59 Nowadays, there is strong evidence that neural dysconnection, namely an abnormal 60 functional integration of brain physiological processes, contributes to symptoms of 61 schizophrenia [7,8]. As discussed in [7], neural dysconnection may be related either to 62 impairments in synaptic plasticity, or to altered anatomical (long-range) connectivity, 63 or to both processes. Impaired synaptic plasticity in schizophrenia has been suggested 64 using electrophysiological techniques [9] or based on neuropathological examinations 65 [10]. Concerning long-range connectivity, Diffusion Tensor Imaging (DTI) represents 66 a unique opportunity to assess in vivo the wiring of white matter connections in 67 patients affected with schizophrenia. An increasing number of DTI studies in patients 68 with schizophrenia are being published and have highlighted aberrant fiber density 69 and organization, most frequently in the prefrontal and temporal regions (reviewed in 70 [11] and [12]). The extent to which abnormal connectivity precedes and predicts the 71 risk of subsequent schizophrenia remains however unclear. Indeed DTI studies in 72 patients at ultra-high risk for psychosis have shown rather inconsistent results, which 73 could be explained by the great heterogeneity of these patients [13].

74

Several studies have employed DTI to analyze brain connectivity in the 22q11DS, a population with a homogenous risk for schizophrenia. The first DTI studies in 22q11DS [14,15,16,17] used Fractional Anisotropy (FA), which is a measure of the global white matter integrity including their myelination status. The most commonly reported findings were a reduction of FA in the parietal and frontal regions [15,17]. However, Fractional Anisotropy analyses do not address the question of whether the 81 trajectories of the bundles (white matter fibers) are similar between the group of 82 patients with 22q11DS and the group of controls. For that purpose, the novel three-83 dimensional tractography technique [18], provides an unprecedented insight on the 84 organization of the white matter pathways and offers the possibility to explore which 85 particular bundles are affected in the 22q11DS. Only two tractography studies have 86 been published to date concerning the 22q11DS, both focusing on the study of the 87 corpus callosum to validate novel image processing techniques [19,20]. To the best of 88 our knowledge, tractography has never been applied to quantify the pattern of whole 89 brain connections in patients with 22q11DS compared to control participants.

90

91 In the present study, we used the connectome technique [21,22] in a sample of 30 92 patients affected with 22q11DS and 30 healthy participants matched for age and 93 gender. This method enables to quantify the brain's global structural connectivity 94 through the extraction of anatomically organized whole-brain connection matrices. 95 These matrices can then be compared between the groups to identify possible brain 96 connectivity alterations. As previous findings in 22q11DS suggest, we expect to find 97 alterations in and in-between lobes. Therefore, we compared lobar connectivity 98 between the two groups. We firstly expected to observe connectivity differences 99 inside the frontal and the occipital lobe, which are frequently reported in patients with 100 22q11DS. Secondly we also expected differences in the fronto-temporal connectivity, 101 which are frequently implicated in the pathogenesis of schizophrenia.

102

103 Methods

104 Sample:

105 *22q11DS group:*

106 Thirty participants with 22q11DS were recruited through parent associations in 107 France, Belgium and Switzerland. All participants and their parents were informed 108 about the study and signed a consent. The protocol was approved beforehand by the 109 Institutional Review Board of Geneva University School of Medicine. The 22q11DS 110 group included 13 girls and 17 boys aged between 7 and 25 years old (mean = $14.8 \pm$ 111 4.0). The 22q11.2 deletion was confirmed using DNA polymorphism analysis based

on a Ouantitative Fluorescent Polymerase Chain Reaction (QF-PCR) performed on 112 113 the deleted region. IQ was measured using the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for 114 Children-Third Edition revised [23] and the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-III 115 [24] for adults. The 22g11DS patient's mean IQ was 70.62 ± 11.8 . On the basis of a 116 clinical evaluation three subjects with 22q11DS met the DSM-IV criteria for a 117 psychotic disorder and seven reported having hallucinations. No participants were 118 under antipsychotic medication. Six patients were under treatment for attention deficit 119 and hyperactivity disorder (methylphenidate).

120

121 Control group:

The control group was recruited among primary school children and among the siblings of patients. The 30 healthy control (HC) participants (14 girls and 16 boys) had a mean age of 14.9 ± 3.7 . No HC had a past or present history of psychiatric or neurological disorders. The mean IQ of the HC group was 105.23 ± 11.01 .

126

127 Image Acquisition:

128 Two cerebral MRIs were acquired for each participant during the same scanning 129 session with a Siemens Trio 3 Tesla scanner. A T1-weighted sequence with a 3D 130 volumetric pulse was collected using the following sequence: TR = 2500 ms, TE = 3131 ms, flip angle = 8° , acquisition matrix of 256x256, field of view = 22 cm, slice 132 thickness = 1.1 mm, 192 slices. The second MRI was a Diffusion Tensor Imaging (DTI) with the following parameters: number of directions = 30, $b = 1000 \text{ s/mm}^2$. TR 133 = 8300 ms, TE = 82 ms, flip angle = 90°, acquisition matrix of 128x128, field of view 134 135 25.6 cm, slice thickness = 2 mm.

136

137 Image Processing:

The Human Connectome [21,22] is a technique that combines the reconstruction of the cortical anatomy and the representation of the underlying white matter fiber pathways. Using the Flirt rigid transformation tool of FSL-FDT software [25,26] we correct the effect of head motion and distortion of eddy currents through an affine alignment of all the weighted diffusion images onto the b0 image, then we register the T1-weighted image on the set of diffusion images. The registered T1-weighted image 144 and the aligned diffusion images are processed separately, producing on one-side 145 accurate mesh models of the cortical surfaces, and on the other side streamlines 146 representing the white matter bundles. In the present study, the diffusion images used 147 were Diffusion Tensor Imaging (DTI). Even though the Human Connectome was 148 primarily developed for the use of Diffusion Spectrum Imaging (DSI), the freely 149 available Human Connectome software (connectomics.org) now provides the 150 possibility to reconstruct the streamlines based on either DTI or DSI.

The reconstructions of the cortical surfaces are obtained from the T1-weighted image using the FreeSurfer software (<u>http://surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu</u>). Semi-automated processing allows the reconstruction of accurate three-dimensional mesh models [27,28] and subcortical regions [29]. The cortical surfaces are subdivided into 66 gyral cortical regions using a validated atlas-based segmentation [30]. FreeSurfer surface reconstruction algorithms have been previously validated against manual delineation on MR images [31] and postmortem brains [32].

158

159 To obtain the white matter bundles, the DTI images are processed with the Diffusion 160 Toolkit software (http://trackvis.org/dtk/) using the streamline algorithm [33]. For 161 each voxel of the white matter volume, the signal is combined from the 30 directions 162 to create an ellipsoid diffusion tensor. Then four streamlines are initiated at each 163 voxel of the white matter mask created by Freesurfer and grow voxel by voxel in both directions of the diffusion tensor. The streamline growth process finishes when both 164 165 ends reach the grey matter mask or when streamlines criteria are reached (max angle 166 60°, min length 3mm, max length 1000mm). Only the curves, called streamlines or 167 fibers, that have both ends finishing at the grey matter mask are retained for the matrix creation. These fibers are estimates of the real white matter axonal bundle 168 169 trajectories [18,34,35].

170

171 Construction of the connection matrix:

172 As a result of the procedure described above, 33 cortical regions of interest (ROI) per 173 hemisphere and several thousand white matter fibers were obtained for each 174 participant. A connection matrix is then constructed by grouping each fiber 175 connecting a pair of ROI *i* and *j* into a bundle B(i,j). The value of the connection

176 matrix cell M(i,j) is the connection density between the corresponding pair of ROIs, 177 defined as follows:

178
$$M(i,j) = \sum_{f \in B(i,j)} \frac{1}{l(f)}$$

179 where l(f) is the length of fiber f along its trajectory. The correction term l(f) in the 180 denominator is needed to eliminate the linear bias towards longer fibers introduced by 181 the tractography algorithm, which uses each voxel in the white matter mask as a seed 182 point.

183

184 The fibers with the lowest FA value are amongst the shortest fibers and their 185 variability is too broad to be considered valid [36]. To overcome this issue, we 186 subtracted these inconsistent fibers using the following approach: 1) an FA matrix 187 was created for each control participant averaging the FA of the fibers connecting 188 each region; 2) the FA matrix of each of the 34 healthy participants was normalized to 189 correct for inter-individual FA differences; 3) the individual matrices were averaged 190 to create a mean FA matrix for the control group. The distribution of these average 191 FA values was explored and revealed a bi-modal distribution, with a narrow 192 distribution in low normalized FA values (0.05 and 0.3) and another in higher FA values (0.3 to 1). After calculating the distribution's quantiles, we successively 193 194 removed the cases of the matrix that had a lower FA value than the quantile until we 195 reached a case of the matrix that was not situated in the diagonal (i.e. not a short 196 fiber). Using this technique, we stopped at the 3rd quantile corresponding to a 197 normalized FA below 0.2731. The cases of the connection matrix that showed a mean 198 FA lower than this 3% were excluded from the group comparison test.

199

200 Statistical analyses:

201 Global analyses:

202 We used an ANCOVA to measure the difference in the total number of fibers between

the patients and the control group using the SPSS software (http://www.spss.com/).

All statistical analyses were controlled for age and gender.

205

206 *Connectivity analyses at the lobar level:*

207 The two-step approach used in this study has been chosen for two reasons. First, our 208 sample of 30 individuals with 22q11DS compared to 30 controls was not sufficient to 209 stand the correction for multiple comparisons on a matrix size of 70x70. Most 210 importantly, in 22q11DS literature many findings on lobar resolution have been found 211 using different imaging technique and our concern was to integrate and compare our 212 findings to previous studies. For this purpose, we created a connectivity matrix for 213 each subject, regrouping the 66 cortical and 4 subcortical areas regions into 5 groups 214 representing 5 "lobes" in each hemisphere. Four conventional lobes were defined as 215 the frontal, parietal, occipital and temporal lobes. The fifth "lobe" was defined as the 216 limbic structure, composed of the four parts of the cingulate gyrus, the entorhinal 217 gyrus, the parahippocampal gyrus, the hippocampus and the amygdala.

218

219 MANCOVAs were used to measure the differences, between the groups, in the 220 number of fibers connecting the lobes within and between themselves. The analyses 221 were covaried for age, gender and the total number of fibers.

222

223 Post-hoc analyses at the regional level:

When a significant connectivity difference was observed at the lobar level, we then looked at the number of fibers in the cortical parcels composing the relevant lobes. The parcel corresponding to the frontal and temporal poles, as well as the bank of the superior temporal sulcus, were not included in the analyses, as these regions showed poor consistency in the validation article [30]. These regional analyses used MANCOVAs to measure the difference in the number of fibers contained in cortical parcels between groups, covarying for age, gender and total number of fibers.

231

232 Effect of Age

Finally, we explored the effect of age on the white matter parameters. For each participant, the total volume of white matter was calculated from the number of voxels contained in the white matter mask. Mean Fractional Anisotropy of the white matter was then measured for each subject. Then three linear regression analyses were performed between age and 1) the mean fractional anisotropy, 2) the total volume of white matter, 3) the total number of fibers.

240 **Results**

In this section, we will only describe significant findings; p-values are reported in Table 1. As detailed in the *Statistical Analyses* section, all analyses were controlled for the covariation of age and gender. The results presented below always refer to the 22q11DS in comparison to the control group.

245

246 Global results:

A significant 10% reduction in the total number of fibers was shown in the 22q11DS group (mean: 43032 ± 4586) in comparison to the control participants (mean: 47423 ± 5739; $F_{1.58}$ = 10.309, p= 0.002).

250

251 Connectivity results:

252 MANCOVAs for each hemisphere and inter-hemisphere connections were corrected 253 for age and gender but also for the 10% reduction observed in 22q11DS for the total 254 number of fibers. Multivariate analyses showed that all intra and inter hemispheric difference between the 22q11DS group and the control group were significant (Wilk's 255 256 lambda for right hemisphere p = 0.032, left hemisphere p<0.001 and inter hemisphere 257 p = 0.002). Amongst the involved lobes, we observed preserved areas (i.e. significant 258 increase) as well as disproportionately reduced areas (i.e. significant decrease) in the number of fibers in patients with 22q11DS compared to controls (Figure 1 and Videos 259 260 S1–S9).

261

262 In the right hemisphere, an increase in the number of fibers was observed within the frontal lobe (Video S1), the parietal lobe (Video S2) and in the amount of parieto-263 264 occipital connections (Video S3). A significant decrease in the number of fibers was 265 seen within the limbic areas (Video S4). In the left hemisphere, the amount of fibers 266 was significantly decreased in the fronto-temporal (Video S5) and the parieto-limbic 267 connections (Video S6), and within the limbic (Video S7) as well as within the 268 occipital lobe (Video S8). When considering the inter-hemispheric connections, a 269 significant decreased number of fibers connecting the left and the right limbic areas 270 (Video S9) was found. Videos are included as supplementary files.

271

272 Regional results:

273 Detailed relative and absolute percentages of the significantly different number of 274 fibers in the cortical parcels between groups are also provided in Table 1. In the right 275 frontal lobe, we found an increased number of fibers in the paracentral parcel, the 276 lateral orbito-frontal parcel, the pars orbitalis parcel and the rostral middle frontal 277 parcel. The medial orbito-frontal parcel showed a decrease in the number of fibers in 278 patients compared to controls.

279

In the right parietal lobe, an increase in the number of fibers was found in the inferior parietal parcel in patients compared to controls. In the limbic structure, the patients showed a decreased number of fibers in the right rostral anterior cingulate parcel, the left posterior cingulate parcel and the left isthmus cingulate but showed an increased number of fibers in the left parahippocampal parcel. In the left occipital lobe, we observed a decrease in the number of fibers in the cuneus parcel for the patients' group.

287

288 Effect of Age on white matter parameters:

In both patient and control groups, a significant increase of the total volume of white matter with age was found (22q11DS: R = 0.425, p=0.010; HC: R = 0.415, p = 0.011). Over the studied age range, the total mean fractional anisotropy grew with age only in the control group (22q11DS: R = 0.225, p =0.116; HC: R = 0.317, p = 0.044).

- The regression analysis shows that the total number of fibers was not dependent of age in both groups (22q11DS: R = 0.163, p= 0.194; HC: R = -0.003 p=0.495).
- 295

296 **Discussion**

297 Relationship with previous DTI studies in 22q11DS:

In this study, we found a significant decrease in the 22q11DS group's brain connectivity. Indeed a 10% decrease in the total number of fibers was observed in patients with 22q11DS compared to healthy participants. 301

In the 22q11DS, the lobar analyses revealed excessive reductions in white matter fibers in the left hemisphere for the fronto-temporal and the occipito-occipital connections. The limbic connections were excessively reduced, both within each hemisphere and between the inter-hemispheric limbic regions. Contrarily, relative preservation of white matter fibers was seen in the right fronto-frontal, parieto-parietal and parieto-occipital connections (Figure 1).

308

At the regional level, relative preservation of connectivity was mainly observed in the right hemisphere (frontal and inferior parietal regions) but also in one region of the left hemisphere (parahippocampal). Excessively reduced connectivity was largely observed in both hemispheres, in the right medial frontal regions (medial orbitofrontal and anterior cingulate), the left inferior frontal, middle temporal and medial posterior regions (posterior cingulate, cuneus, precuneus).

315

316 To date, five studies have been published using FA to measure connectivity changes 317 in 22q11DS [14,15,16,17,37]. Among these five studies, two used previously 318 published sample of patients, either improving the image registration [17] or 319 providing new results correlating connectivity with cognitive skills [14]. Increased FA 320 was reported around the splenium of the corpus callosum [15,16], but it has been 321 suggested that those results represent a registration artifact [17]. Findings in the 322 frontal lobe have been inconsistent: one study observed a bilateral increased FA [17], whereas other studies observed asymmetric findings between the two hemispheres: 323 324 increased FA in the left frontal lobe [37] and decreased FA in the right frontal lobe 325 [15,37]. The findings obtained in the parietal lobe also showed some inconsistencies: 326 increased FA bilaterally [17], reduced FA bilaterally [15] and decreased FA in the 327 right post-central area. As FA values are known to increase between childhood and 328 early adulthood [38], these inconsistencies may rely on the different age ranges of the 329 patients (7-14 years [16,17], 7-22 years [14,15], adults [37]).

330

In this study, we also observed an enlargement of white matter volume with age in both groups, which was associated with an increase of the total mean FA in the control group. On the contrary, the number of fibers was not significantly affected by age in any of the diagnosis groups, suggesting that the connectome technique may not 335 be very sensitive to the maturational changes occurring during childhood and 336 adolescence. The reason for this low sensitivity may rely on the maturation process of 337 white matter: the increase of FA is driven by a reduction of the radial diffusivity [39]. 338 Streamline tractography using DTI images ranks the 3 eigenvectors (axial and both 339 radial diffusivity vectors) from the largest to the smallest and uses only the orientation 340 of the first ranked vector. As a result, the tractography constructs 3D fibers following 341 only the orientation of the first vector, and ignores the radial diffusivity that is known 342 to be the most sensitive measure of the maturational process [38].

343

344 Fronto-temporal disconnectivity as a vulnerability factor for

345 schizophrenia:

346 Given the relatively low sensitivity of our method to dynamic changes occurring from 347 childhood to adulthood, we argue that our results most likely reveal an altered 348 configuration of white matter tracts that is observable at all ages in the syndrome. Part 349 of the abnormal connectivity that we observe in patients with 22q11DS may indeed 350 constitute a vulnerability factor for schizophrenia, already existing years before the 351 onset of the symptoms. For instance, we found evidence of decreased connectivity in 352 the left fronto-temporal tracts in patients with 22q11DS compared to controls. 353 Disrupted integrity of the left fronto-temporal tract (including the arcuate and 354 uncinate fasciculus) has been largely implicated in the pathogenesis of schizophrenia 355 [40]. More specifically, alterations to the integrity of the left arcuate fasciculus have 356 been related to auditory hallucinations [41,42]. It has been hypothesized that 357 alterations in the connectivity of the Heschl's gyrus impairs the ability to monitor 358 inner speech leading to confusions between self generated thoughts and external 359 perceptions. Source monitoring impairment is considered a cognitive marker for 360 schizophrenia [43] and has been previously revealed in 22q11DS [44]. Also, we 361 observed decreased connectivity at several levels in the limbic system of patients with 362 22q11DS (within the limbic system bilaterally, between the left and right limbic 363 systems and in the left parieto-limbic connections). Similar alterations in limbic 364 connectivity have also been reported in patients with schizophrenia [45]. Disruption 365 of the dorsal cingulum bundle in schizophrenia is frequently related to deficits in executive functions and specifically in selective attention [46,47], aptitudes that areknown to be affected in 22q11DS [48,49,50].

368

369 Relevance of the disconnectivity for other symptoms observed

370 in 22q11DS:

371 The abnormal connectivity observed in our study represents the first evidence of disconnectivity in the 22q11DS, as assessed with whole-brain tractography. Similarly 372 373 to schizophrenia [7], converging evidence points to disconnectivity in 22q11.2 374 deletion syndrome at several levels. For instance, abnormalities in mismatch 375 negativity were reported using EEG, suggesting disrupted functional fronto-temporal connectivity [51]. Major neuronal disorganization and disturbances in structural 376 377 neuronal connectivity has been observed in neuropathologic examinations [52]. 378 Finally, exaggerated cortical thinning during adolescence in patients with 22q11DS 379 provides a hint for altered dynamics in the synaptic plasticity of this disorder [53]. All 380 this evidence points to the need to further assess the disconnectivity hypothesis in the 381 context of 22q11DS, e.g. benefiting from the recent advances in the network science 382 [54].

383

384 Apart from their potential role in the increased susceptibility to psychosis, the present 385 findings can also be interpreted in the light of other symptoms observed in 22q11DS. 386 Indeed, schizophrenia disorder has received a large interest as it is commonly 387 considered as a behavioral phenotype specific to the syndrome [55]. However, 388 although less specific, other psychiatric diagnoses are even more frequent in patients 389 with 22q11DS. In a large cohort of 172 children, adolescents and adults with 390 22q11DS, Green and colleagues recently reported a 73% rate of DSM-IV psychiatric 391 diagnoses [56]. The most frequent diagnostic category was anxiety disorder (52%) 392 followed by disruptive disorder (41%) and mood disorder (15%). The significantly 393 decreased connectivity in the limbic system, and more specifically at the level of the 394 cingulum bundles bilaterally, may partly be related to these other psychiatric 395 diagnoses in 22q11DS. Indeed, altered connectivity in the limbic system has been 396 previously reported in several disorders - in depression (reviewed in [57]), ADHD 397 [58] and obsessive-compulsive disorder [59]. Other disorders not specifically

associated with 22q11DS also exhibit altered connectivity in the cingulum bundles,
such as Alzheimer [60], mild cognitive impairments [61], alcoholism [62],
posttraumatic stress disorder [63], underling the potentially non-specific effect of
altered limbic connectivity in the development of psychiatric disorders.

402

403 Altered connectivity has also been observed in the opposite direction, namely with a 404 relative increase in the number of fibers. Increased connectivity has been located in 405 the frontal and the parietal local (intra-lobar) fibers. In the frontal lobe, increased 406 connectivity coincides with our previous results of increased cortical thickness in 407 children with 22q11DS [53]. It may be the case that the atypically constituted network 408 of frontal long-range connections co-exists with abnormal cortical structure in this 409 region. In 22q11DS adolescents, we observe a collapse in frontal cortical thickness, 410 suggesting that the disorganized cerebral architecture undergoes an uncontrolled 411 pruning, which may later be associated with the onset of schizophrenia. This 412 hypothesis of co-existing connections both at the intra-cortical and the long-range 413 level does not however account for the increased connectivity currently seen in the 414 parietal lobe, as the cortical thickness is not predominantly altered in this region. The 415 causes of the concomitant increased connectivity in the frontal and the parietal lobe 416 may thus rely on another, yet unknown, mechanism.

417

Except for increased connectivity in the parietal lobe, a notable relationship seems to 418 419 exist between the direction of the altered connectivity and the gray matter volumetric 420 differences reported in the syndrome, even after correction for the total number of 421 virtual fibers. Indeed, the greater frontal connectivity together with the decreased 422 occipital connectivity parallels the commonly observed rostro-caudal gradient of 423 volumetric changes [16,64,65,66]. The increased connectivity of the intra-parietal 424 connections and the decreased connectivity of the limbic bundles points out the 425 volumetric latero-medial gradient already observed in 22q11DS [66]. As exposed 426 above these "mirrored" findings may be explained by the existence of a strong 427 relationship between the intra-cortical structure and the long-range white matter tract organization. 428

429

430 Limitations:

431 The current study is the first to provide a whole brain quantification of the three-432 dimensional axonal tracts in 22q11DS, without the limitations related to the voxel-433 based analysis. Despite our concern to use one of the most sophisticated techniques 434 available to date, our study bears the same limitations as all other tractography 435 studies. Major limitations, detailed in [34], include among others the current absence 436 of *in vitro* validation of the fiber tracts reconstructed with tractography and the lower 437 resolution of the DTI images compared to T1-weighted images. Recent analysis of 438 tractography reconstruction method revealed bias in accounting for the number of 439 fibers created [67]. The bias, a distance-related effect, will over evaluate the number 440 of fibers in bundles that show a high fractional anisotropy and will under evaluate 441 those with a low FA. Given that to date no accurate correction is available for this 442 bias, we decided to apply a simple linear correction for the length of fiber. This might 443 result in an under evaluation of the number of short connections where FA is low. 444 However, all the MRI images were processed with the same bias correction and 445 therefore no positive results could be accounted for the distance-related effect.

446 In the present study, we chose to use the Freesurfer parcellation scheme. This choice 447 was driven by the goal to describe the white matter axonal architecture corresponding 448 to regions delimited with primary and secondary sulci, that are the most reliable both 449 at the intra- and inter-subject level. To obtain a more fine grained representation of 450 the white matter changes, we could have used another parcellation with a larger 451 amount of smaller parcels. However, increasing the number of parcel by reducing 452 their size implicates several issues. Firstly, the reliability between subjects will be 453 reduced, introducing supplementary noise in the data. Secondly, a larger number of 454 parcels increases the number of connections to test and therefore raises the severity of 455 the FWE corrections. All these elements would decrease the number of significant 456 findings and would implicate to increase the number of participants for a similar 457 study.

458

459 **Supporting Information**

460 Video S1.

461 360° visualization of the connections within the right frontal lobe

463	Video S2.
464	360° visualization of the connections within the right parietal lobe
465	
466	Video S3
467	360° visualization of the right parieto-occipital connections
468	
469	Video S4
470	360° visualization of the connections within the right limbic areas
471	
472	Video S5
473	360° visualization of the left fronto-temporal connections
474	
475	Video S6
476	360° visualization of the left parieto-limbic connections
477	
478	Video S7
479	360° visualization of the connections within the left limbic areas
480	
481	Video S8
482	360° visualization of the connections within the left occipital lobe
483	
484	Video S9
485	360° visualization of the inter limbic connections
486	
487	Acknowledgments

488 The authors would like to warmly thank all the participants and their family for

489 volunteering in this study. We also greatly thank Sarah Menghetti for organizing and

490	collecting data, and Jason Last for proof reading this manuscript. Our thank goes also
491	to François Lazeyras, Frank Henri, Yohann Ouvrier-Buffet and Alessandro Daducci.

492

493 **References**

1. Reiss A, Eliez S, Schmitt J, Patwardhan A, Haberecht M (2000) Brain imaging in 494 495 neurogenetic conditions: realizing the potential of behavioral neurogenetics 496 research. Ment Retard Dev Disabil Res Rev 6: 186-197. 497 2. Bassett A, Chow E (1999) 22q11 deletion syndrome: a genetic subtype of 498 schizophrenia. Biol Psychiatry 46: 882-891. 499 3. Murphy KC, Owen M (2001) Velo-cardio-facial syndrome: a model for 500 understanding the genetics and pathogenesis of schizophrenia. The British 501 Journal of Psychiatry 179: 397-402. 502 4. Gothelf D, Feinstein C, Thompson T, Gu E, Penniman L, et al. (2007) Risk factors 503 for the emergence of psychotic disorders in adolescents with 22g11.2 deletion 504 syndrome. Am J Psychiatry 164: 663-669. 505 5. Debbane M, Glaser B, David M, Feinstein C, Eliez S (2006) Psychotic symptoms 506 in children and adolescents with 22q11.2 deletion syndrome: 507 Neuropsychological and behavioral implications. Schizophr Res 84: 187-193. 508 6. Keshavan M, Prasad K, Pearlson G (2007) Are brain structural abnormalities useful 509 as endophenotypes in schizophrenia? Int Rev Psychiatry 19: 397-406. 510 7. Stephan KE, Friston KJ, Frith CD (2009) Dysconnection in schizophrenia: from 511 abnormal synaptic plasticity to failures of self-monitoring. Schizophr Bull 35: 512 509-527. 513 8. Friston K (1998) The disconnection hypothesis. Schizophr Res 30: 115-125. 514 9. Spencer KM, Nestor PG, Perlmutter R, Niznikiewicz MA, Klump MC, et al. (2004) 515 Neural synchrony indexes disordered perception and cognition in 516 schizophrenia. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 101: 17288-17293. 517 10. Garey LJ, Ong WY, Patel TS, Kanani M, Davis A, et al. (1998) Reduced dendritic spine density on cerebral cortical pyramidal neurons in schizophrenia. J 518 519 Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 65: 446-453. 520 11. Ellison-Wright I, Bullmore E (2009) Meta-analysis of diffusion tensor imaging studies in schizophrenia. Schizophr Res 108: 3-10. 521 522 12. Rubinov M, Bassett D (2011) Emerging Evidence of Connectomic Abnormalities 523 in Schizophrenia. J Neurosci 31: 6263-6265. 524 13. Peters BD, Blaas J, de Haan L (2010) Diffusion tensor imaging in the early phase 525 of schizophrenia: what have we learned? J Psychiatr Res 44: 993-1004. 526 14. Barnea-Goraly N, Eliez S, Menon V, Bammer R, Reiss A (2005) Arithmetic 527 ability and parietal alterations: a diffusion tensor imaging study in 528 velocardiofacial syndrome. Cognitive Brain Research 25: 735-740. 529 15. Barnea-Goraly N, Menon V, Krasnow B, Ko A, Reiss A, et al. (2003) 530 Investigation of white matter structure in velocardiofacial syndrome: a 531 diffusion tensor imaging study. Am J Psychiatry 160: 1863-1869. 532 16. Simon T, Ding L, Bish J, McDonald-McGinn D, Zackai E, et al. (2005) 533 Volumetric, connective, and morphologic changes in the brains of children 534 with chromosome 22q11. 2 deletion syndrome: an integrative study. 535 NeuroImage 25: 169-180.

536	17. Simon T, Wu Z, Avants B, Zhang H, Gee J, et al. (2008) Atypical cortical
537	connectivity and visuospatial cognitive impairments are related in children
538	with chromosome 22q11.2 deletion syndrome. Behav Brain Funct 4: 25.
539	18. Hagmann P, Thiran J, Jonasson L, Vandergheynst P, Clarke S, et al. (2003) DTI
540	mapping of human brain connectivity: statistical fibre tracking and virtual
541	dissection. NeuroImage 19: 545-554.
542	19. Yushkevich PA, Zhang H, Simon TJ, Gee JC (2008) Structure-specific statistical
543	mapping of white matter tracts. NeuroImage 41: 448-461.
544	20. Sun H, Yushkevich PA, Zhang H, Cook PA, Duda JT, et al. (2007) Shape-based
545	normalization of the corpus callosum for DTI connectivity analysis. IEEE
546	Trans Med Imaging 26: 1166-1178.
547	21. Hagmann P, Cammoun L, Gigandet X, Meuli R, Honey CJ, et al. (2008) Mapping
548	the structural core of the human cerebral cortex. PLoS Biology 6: e159.
549	22. Cammoun L, Gigandet X, Meskaldji D, Thiran JP, Sporns O, et al. (2011)
550	Mapping the human connectome at multiple scales with diffusion spectrum
551	MRI. J Neurosci Methods.
552	23. Wechsler D (1991) Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Third edition.
553	Manual. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.
554	24. Wechsler D (1997) Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - Third edition.
555	Administration and Scoring manual. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological
556	Corporation.
557	25. Jenkinson M, Bannister P, Brady M, Smith S (2002) Improved optimization for
558	the robust and accurate linear registration and motion correction of brain
559	images. Neuroimage 17: 825-841.
560	26. Jenkinson M, Smith S (2001) A global optimisation method for robust affine
561	registration of brain images. Med Image Anal 5: 143-156.
562	27. Dale A, Fischl B, Sereno M (1999) Cortical surface-based analysis. I.
563	Segmentation and surface reconstruction. Neuroimage 9: 179-194.
564	28. Fischl B, Sereno M, Dale A (1999) Cortical surface-based analysis. II: Inflation,
565	flattening, and a surface-based coordinate system. Neuroimage 9: 195-207.
566	29. Fischl B, Salat D, Busa E, Albert M, Dieterich M, et al. (2002) Whole brain
567	segmentation: automated labeling of neuroanatomical structures in the human
568	brain. Neuron 33: 341-355.
569	30. Desikan R, Segonne F, Fischl B, Quinn B, Dickerson B, et al. (2006) An
570	automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI
571	scans into gyral based regions of interest. Neuroimage 31: 968-980.
572	31. Kuperberg G, Broome M, McGuire P, David A, Eddy M, et al. (2003) Regionally
573	localized thinning of the cerebral cortex in schizophrenia. Arch Gen
574	Psychiatry 60: $8/8-888$.
5/5	32. Rosas H, Liu A, Hersch S, Glessner M, Ferrante R, et al. (2002) Regional and
5/6	progressive thinning of the cortical ribbon in Huntington's disease. Neurology
5//	28: 095-701.
570	33. Mori S, Crain BJ, Chacko VP, van Ziji PC (1999) Infee-dimensional tracking of
5/9	axonal projections in the orain by magnetic resonance imaging. Ann Neurol
501	45. 205-209. 24. Dammar B. Agar B. Magalay M (2002) In vive MB tractography using diffusion.
587	imaging Fur I Padial 45: 222 234
502 583	Inaging, Bui J Kauloi 43, 223-234. 25 Hagmann P. Jonasson I. Maadar D. Thiran I. Wadaan V. at al. (2006)
58/	Understanding diffusion MR imaging techniques: from scalar diffusion
JUT	Onderstanding unrusion with imaging teeningues. Itom sealar unrusion-

585	weighted imaging to diffusion tensor imaging and beyond. Radiographics 26
586	Suppl 1: S205-223.
587	36. Gigandet X, Hagmann P, Kurant M, Cammoun L, Meuli R, et al. (2008)
588	Estimating the confidence level of white matter connections obtained with
589	MRI tractography. PLoS One 3: e4006.
590	37. da Silva Alves F, Schmitz N, Bloemen O, van der Meer J, Meijer J, et al. (2011)
591	White matter abnormalities in adults with 22q11 deletion syndrome with and
592	without schizophrenia. Schizophr Res 132: 75-83.
593	38. Westlye L, Walhovd K, Dale A, Bjornerud A, Due-Tonnessen P, et al. (2010)
594	Life-span changes of the human brain white matter: diffusion tensor imaging
595	(DTI) and volumetry. Cereb Cortex 20: 2055-2068.
596	39. Schmithorst V, Yuan W (2010) White matter development during adolescence as
597	shown by diffusion MRI. Brain Cogn 72: 16-25.
598	40. Kubicki M, McCarley R, Westin C, Park H, Maier S, et al. (2007) A review of
599	diffusion tensor imaging studies in schizophrenia. J Psychiatr Res 41: 15-30.
600	41. Hubl D, Koenig T, Strik W, Federspiel A, Kreis R, et al. (2004) Pathways that
601	make voices: white matter changes in auditory hallucinations. Arch Gen
602	Psychiatry 61: 658-668.
603	42. Catani M, Craig MC, Forkel SJ, Kanaan R, Picchioni M, et al. (2011) Altered
604	Integrity of Perisylvian Language Pathways in Schizophrenia: Relationship to
605	Auditory Hallucinations. Biol Psychiatry 70:1143-50.
606	43. Brebion G, Gorman JM, Amador X, Malaspina D, Sharif Z (2002) Source
607	monitoring impairments in schizophrenia: characterisation and associations
608	with positive and negative symptomatology. Psychiatry Res 112: 27-39.
609	44. Debbane M, Van der Linden M, Glaser B, Eliez S (2008) Source monitoring for
610	actions in adolescents with 22q11.2 deletion syndrome (22q11DS). Psychol
611	Med 38: 811-820.
612	45. Takei K, Yamasue H, Abe O, Yamada H, Inoue H, et al. (2009) Structural
613	disruption of the dorsal cingulum bundle is associated with impaired Stroop
614	performance in patients with schizophrenia. Schizophr Res 114: 119-127.
615	46. Kubicki M, Westin CF, Nestor PG, Wible CG, Frumin M, et al. (2003) Cingulate
616	fasciculus integrity disruption in schizophrenia: a magnetic resonance
617	diffusion tensor imaging study. Biol Psychiatry 54: 1171-1180.
618	47. Nestor PG, Kubicki M, Niznikiewicz M, Gurrera RJ, McCarley RW, et al. (2008)
619	Neuropsychological disturbance in schizophrenia: a diffusion tensor imaging
620	study. Neuropsychology 22: 246-254.
621	48. Campbell LE, Azuma R, Ambery F, Stevens A, Smith A, et al. (2010) Executive
622	functions and memory abilities in children with 22q11.2 deletion syndrome.
623	Aust N Z J Psychiatry 44: 364-371.
624	49. Stoddard J, Beckett L, Simon TJ (2011) Atypical development of the executive
625	attention network in children with chromosome 22q11.2 deletion syndrome. J
626	Neurodev Disord 3: 76-85.
627	50. Dufour F, Schaer M, Debbane M, Farhoumand R, Glaser B, et al. (2008)
628	Cingulate gyral reductions are related to low executive functioning and
629	psychotic symptoms in 22q 11.2 deletion syndrome. Neuropsychologia 46:
630	2986-2992.
631	51. Baker K, Baldeweg T, Sivagnanasundaram S, Scambler P, Skuse D (2005) COMT
632	Val108/158 Met modifies mismatch negativity and cognitive function in
633	22q11 deletion syndrome. Biol Psychiatry 58: 23-31.

634	52. Kiehl TR, Chow EW, Mikulis DJ, George SR, Bassett AS (2009)
635	Neuropathologic features in adults with 22q11.2 deletion syndrome. Cereb
636	Cortex 19: 153-164.
637	53 Schaer M Debbane M Bach Cuadra M Ottet M Glaser B et al. (2009) Deviant
638	trajectories of cortical maturation in 22a11 2 deletion syndrome (22a11DS): a
639	cross-sectional and longitudinal study. Schizonhr Res 115: 182-190
640	54. Pullmore E. Sporns $O(2000)$ Complex brain networks: graph theoretical analysis
641	of structural and functional systems. Not Day Neurosai 10: 196-102
642	55 Catholf D. Sahaar M. Elian S. (2009) Canage having devialent ment and neurohistric
042	55. Gomen D, Schael M, Enez S (2008) Genes, brain development and psychiatric
643	pnenotypes in velo-cardio-racial syndrome. Dev Disabil Res Rev 14: 59-68.
644	56. Green I, Gotnelf D, Glaser B, Debbane M, Frisch A, et al. (2009) Psychiatric
645	disorders and intellectual functioning throughout development in
646	velocardiofacial (22q11.2 deletion) syndrome. J Am Acad Child Adolesc
647	Psychiatry 48: 1060-1068.
648	57. Hulvershorn LA, Cullen K, Anand A (2011) Toward dysfunctional connectivity: a
649	review of neuroimaging findings in pediatric major depressive disorder. Brain
650	Imaging Behav 5: 307-328.
651	58. Konrad A, Dielentheis TF, El Masri D, Bayerl M, Fehr C, et al. (2010) Disturbed
652	structural connectivity is related to inattention and impulsivity in adult
653	attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Eur J Neurosci 31: 912-919.
654	59. Nakamae T, Narumoto J, Sakai Y, Nishida S, Yamada K, et al. (2011) Diffusion
655	tensor imaging and tract-based spatial statistics in obsessive-compulsive
656	disorder. J Psychiatr Res 45: 687-690.
657	60. Bozoki AC, Korolev IO, Davis NC, Hoisington LA, Berger KL (2011) Disruption
658	of limbic white matter pathways in mild cognitive impairment and
659	Alzheimer's disease: A DTI/FDG-PET Study. Hum Brain Mapp 33: 1792-802.
660	61. Chua TC, Wen W, Chen X, Kochan N, Slavin MJ, et al. (2009) Diffusion tensor
661	imaging of the posterior cingulate is a useful biomarker of mild cognitive
662	impairment. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 17: 602-613.
663	62. Harris GJ, Jaffin SK, Hodge SM, Kennedy D, Caviness VS, et al. (2008) Frontal
664	white matter and cingulum diffusion tensor imaging deficits in alcoholism.
665	Alcohol Clin Exp Res 32: 1001-1013.
666	63. Kim MJ, Lyoo IK, Kim SJ, Sim M, Kim N, et al. (2005) Disrupted white matter
667	tract integrity of anterior cingulate in trauma survivors. Neuroreport 16: 1049-
668	1053.
669	64. Eliez S, Schmitt J, White C, Reiss A (2000) Children and adolescents with
670	velocardiofacial syndrome: a volumetric MRI study. American Journal of
671	Psychiatry 157: 409.
672	65 Kates W Burnette C Bessette B Folley B Strunge L et al (2004) Frontal and
673	caudate alterations in velocardiofacial syndrome (deletion at chromosome
674	22a11 2) Journal of child neurology 19. 337
675	66 Schaer M Glaser B Ottet M Schneider M Bach Cuadra M et al (2010)
676	Regional cortical volumes and congenital heart disease: a MRI study in
677	22a11 2 deletion syndrome. I Neurodev Disord 2: 224-234
678	67 Li L Rilling I Preuss T Glasser M Hu X (2012) The Effects of Connection
679	Reconstruction Method on the Interregional Connectivity of Brain Networks
680	via Diffusion Tractography. Hum Brain Mann 33: 184-1913
681	The Diffusion Theory Fraphy. Them Drain Mapp 55, 107-1715.
687	
002	
683	

Figure 1: <u>Three-dimensional representations of the virtual fibers with significant</u>
differences between patients and controls

685 Inside the three-dimensional cortical view of each hemisphere in light grey, each 686 segment of the fibers are represented with 3 canonical directional color gradients, 687 green for anterior-posterior axis, blue for bottom-up axis and red for left-right axis. 688 Virtual fibers have been regrouped in "Tube" shape by TrackVis Software 689 (http://trackvis.org/). Part A represents the decrease in the left fronto-temporal 690 connections comprising the arcuate and the uncinate fasciculus (Video S5). Part B 691 represents the increase in the frontal lobe intra connections (Video S1) and the 692 decrease in the left occipital intra connections (Video S8). Part C shows the increase 693 in the right parietal intra connections (Video S2) and parieto-occipital connections 694 (Video S3). Part D illustrates the decrease in bilateral limbic intra and inter 695 connections (Video S4, S7 and S9) and the left parieto-limbic connections (Video S6). 696

696 Table 1: Percentage of absolute and relative difference in the number of fibers inter-

697 and intra-lobe between 22q11DS and the control group and their significance (*

Total number of fibers 90 % / 10.309 0.00 Right Hemisphere 99.2 % $+ 9.2 %$ 17.442 <0.0 Parieto-occipital 112.9 % $+ 22.9 %$ 7.148 0.01 connections 93.1 % $+ 3.1 %$ 5.826 0.01 Parietal lobe 93.1 % $+ 3.1 %$ 5.826 0.01 Limbic structure 83.5 % $- 6.5 %$ 6.152 0.01 Left Hemisphere 56.1 % $- 33.9 %$ 11.933 <0.0 connections 79.7 % $- 10.3 %$ 4.599 0.02 connections 79.7 % $- 10.3 %$ 4.599 0.02 connections 72 % $- 18 %$ 10.01 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere 79.4 % $- 10.6 %$ 6.363 0.01 connections 80.7 % $- 9.3 %$ 12.595 0.00 forntal Rostral anterior 63.3 % $- 26.7 %$ 9.722 0.00 cingulate 112.4 % $+ 22.4 %$ 7.494 0.00 frontal 96.2 %	Anatomical Structure	Absolute difference (%)	Relative difference (%)	F[1,58]	Р
Bibers Right Hemisphere 99.2 % + 9.2 % 17.442 <0.0	Total number of	90 %	/	10.309	0.002
Right Hemisphere 99.2 % $+ 9.2 %$ 17.442 <0.0 Parietal lobe 99.2 % $+ 22.9 \%$ 7.148 0.01 connections Parietal lobe 93.1 % $+ 3.1 \%$ 5.826 0.01 Limbic structure 83.5% $- 6.5 \%$ 6.152 0.01 Limbic structure 83.5% $- 6.5 \%$ 6.152 0.01 Left Hemisphere 79.7% $- 10.3 \%$ 4.599 0.02 connections 79.7% $- 10.3 \%$ 4.599 0.02 connections 79.7% $- 10.3 \%$ 4.599 0.02 connections 72% $- 18 \%$ 10.01 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere 116.6% $+ 26.6 \%$ 18.569 < 0.02 Inter limbic 79.4% $- 10.6 \%$ 6.363 0.01 connections 57.7% 7.065 0.00 frontal 79.4% $- 10.6 \%$ 6.363 0.01 connections 79.4% $- 26.7 \%$ 9.722 0.00	fibers				
Hemisphere 99.2 % $+ 9.2 \%$ 17.442 < 0.0 Parieto-occipital 112.9% $+ 22.9 \%$ 7.148 0.01 connections 93.1% $+ 3.1 \%$ 5.826 0.01 Limbic structure 83.5% $- 6.5 \%$ 6.152 0.01 Left Hemisphere Fronto-temporal 56.1% $- 33.9 \%$ 11.933 $< 0.0 \%$ Parieto-limbic 79.7% $- 10.3 \%$ 4.599 0.03% connections 84.3% $- 5.7 \%$ 7.065 0.01 Decipital lobe 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere 116.6% $+ 26.6 \%$ 18.569 $< 0.0 \%$ Connections 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere 112.4% $+ 22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 Connections 112.4% $+ 22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 Rostral anterior 63.3% $- 26.7\%$ 9.722 0.00 Inferior parietal 96.2% $+ 6.2\%$ <td< td=""><td>Right</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Right				
Frontal lobe 99.2% $+ 9.2 \%$ 17.442 < 0.0 Parieto-occipital 112.9% $+ 22.9 \%$ 7.148 0.01 connections 83.1% $+ 3.1 \%$ 5.826 0.01 Limbic structure 83.5% $- 6.5 \%$ 6.152 0.01 Left Hemisphere 7.148 0.01 Fronto-temporal 56.1% $- 33.9 \%$ 11.933 $< 0.0 \%$ connections 79.7% $- 10.3 \%$ 4.599 0.05% connections 79.7% $- 10.3 \%$ 4.599 0.05% connections 72% $- 18 \%$ 10.01 0.00% connections 72% $- 18 \%$ 10.01 0.00% connections 72% $- 10.6 \%$ 6.363 0.01% connections 79.4% $- 10.6 \%$ 6.363 0.01% connections 79.4% $- 26.7 \%$ 9.722 0.00% fontal 79.4% $- 26.7 \%$ 9.722 0.00% cingulate 112.4% $+ 22.4 \%$	Hemisphere	_			
Parieto-occipital 112.9% $+22.9\%$ 7.148 0.01 connections 93.1% $+3.1\%$ 5.826 0.01 Limbic structure 83.5% -6.5% 6.152 0.01 Left Hemisphere 83.5% -6.5% 6.152 0.01 Left Hemisphere 77% -10.3% 4.599 0.02 connections 79.7% -10.3% 4.599 0.02 connections 79.7% -10.3% 4.599 0.02 connections 79.7% -10.3% 4.599 0.02 connections 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Decipital lobe 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere 116.6% $+26.6\%$ 18.569 0.00 connections 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connections 79.4% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 forntal 112.4% $+22.4\%$ 7.494 0.00 ingulate 103.7% $+13$	Frontal lobe	99.2 %	+ 9.2 %	17.442	<0.001**
connections 93.1 % $+ 3.1 \%$ 5.826 0.01 Limbic structure 83.5 % $- 6.5 \%$ 6.152 0.01 Left Hemisphere 56.1 % $- 33.9 \%$ 11.933 <0.0	Parieto-occipital	112.9 %	+ 22.9 %	7.148	0.010
Parietal lobe 93.1% $+3.1\%$ 5.826 0.01 Limbic structure 83.5% -6.5% 6.152 0.01 Left Hemisphere 56.1% -33.9% 11.933 < 0.01 Connections 79.7% -10.3% 4.599 0.03 connections 84.3% -5.7% 7.065 0.01 Decipital lobe 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Inter-Hemisphere 72% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connections 79.4% -26.6% 18.569 <0.00 Right parcels 79.4% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 Ground 80.7% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 Interlucture 12.4% $+22.4\%$ 7.494 0.00 Grounal 103.7% $+13.7\%$ <t< td=""><td>connections</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	connections				
Limbic structure 83.5% -6.5% 6.152 0.01 Left Hemisphere 56.1% -33.9% 11.933 <0.01 Fronto-temporal connections 79.7% -10.3% 4.599 0.02 Parieto-limbic connections 79.7% -10.3% 4.599 0.02 Connections 84.3% -5.7% 7.065 0.01 Decipital lobe 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 Inter limbic connections 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 Right parcels Paracentral 116.6% $+26.6\%$ 18.569 <0.00 Right parcels 112.4% $+22.4\%$ 7.494 $0.00 10.147 0.00$	Parietal lobe	93.1 %	+ 3.1 %	5.826	0.019
Left Hemisphere Fronto-temporal 56.1% -33.9% 11.933 <0.0 Parieto-limbic 79.7% -10.3% 4.599 0.03 connections Limbic structure 84.3% -5.7% 7.065 0.01 Occipital lobe 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere 11.66% -26.6% 8.633 0.01 Connections 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connections 79.4% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 frontal 7% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 frontal 112.4% $+22.4\%$ 7.494 0.00 frontal 103.7% $+13.7\%$ 6.167 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+13.7\%$ 6.167 0.01	Limbic structure	83.5 %	- 6.5 %	6.152	0.016
Fronto-temporal connections 56.1% -33.9% 11.933 <0.0 Parieto-limbic connections 79.7% -10.3% 4.599 0.02 Connections 2.57% 7.065 0.01 Decipital lobe 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere 11.66% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 Inter limbic connections 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connections 79.4% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 frontal 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 frontal 112.4% $+22.4\%$ 7.494 0.00 frontal 96.2% $+6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+13.7\%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7%	Left Hemisphere				
connectionsParieto-limbic 79.7% -10.3% 4.599 0.03 ConnectionsStructure 84.3% -5.7% 7.065 0.01 Occipital lobe 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Inter-HemisphereInter limbic 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connections 79.4% -26.6% 18.569 <0.0 Right parcels 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 Paracentral 116.6% $+26.7 \%$ 9.722 0.00 Medial-orbito- 80.7% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 Frontal 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 Rostral anterior 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 Cingulate 112.4% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 Inferior parietal 96.2% $+6.2 \%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Inferior parietal 73.2% -16.8% 10.147 0.00 Para hippocampal 115.6% $+25.6 \%$ 7.666 0.00	Fronto-temporal	56.1 %	- 33.9 %	11.933	<0.001**
Parieto-limbic 79.7% -10.3% 4.599 0.05 connections 84.3% -5.7% 7.065 0.01 Decipital lobe 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere 10.6% 6.363 0.01 Inter- Hemisphere 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connections 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 frontal 80.7% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 Inferior parietal 96.2% $+6.2 \%$ 6.690 0.01 frontal 97.1% <	connections				
connections 84.3 % -5.7% 7.065 0.01 Occipital lobe 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere -10.6% 6.363 0.01 Inter limbic 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connections 80.7% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 Cingulate 112.4% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 Ketral-orbito- 112.4% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 Risplane 103.7% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 77.2% $-12.$	Parieto-limbic	79.7 %	- 10.3 %	4.599	0.036
Limbic structure 84.3% -5.7% 7.065 0.01 Occipital lobe 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere 10.01 0.01 Inter- Hemisphere 10.01 0.01 Inter- Hemisphere 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 Connections Right parcels 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 Right parcels Paracentral 116.6% $+26.6 \%$ 18.569 <0.0 Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 Rostral anterior 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 Cingulate 112.4% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 Inferior parietal 96.2% $+6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Poste	connections				
Occipital lobe 72% -18% 10.01 0.00 Inter- Hemisphere Inter limbic 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connections 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 Right parcels 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connections 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 frontal Rostral anterior 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 frontal Inferior parietal 96.2% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+7.1 \%$ 6.306 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Posterior 77.2% -12.8% </td <td>Limbic structure</td> <td>84.3 %</td> <td>- 5.7 %</td> <td>7.065</td> <td>0.01</td>	Limbic structure	84.3 %	- 5.7 %	7.065	0.01
Inter- Hemisphere Inter limbic 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connections Right parcels Paracentral 116.6% $+26.6 \%$ 18.569 $<0.0 \%$ Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00% Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00% frontal Rostral anterior 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00% Lateral-orbito- 112.4% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00% cingulate Lateral-orbito- 112.4% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00% Inferior parietal 96.2% $+6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+7.1 \%$ 6.306 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+12.8\%$ 15.744 $<0.00 \%$ Cuneus 73.2% -16.8% 10.147	Occipital lobe	72 %	- 18 %	10.01	0.003*
Hemisphere Inter limbic 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connections Right parcels Paracentral 116.6% $+26.6 \%$ 18.569 <0.0 Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 frontal Rostral anterior 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 cingulate Lateral-orbito- 112.4% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 Inferior parietal 96.2% $+6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+7.1 \%$ 6.306 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcels Posterior 77.2% -12.8% 15.744 <0.02 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+25.6 \%$ 17.666 0.00	Inter-				
Inter limbic 79.4% -10.6% 6.363 0.01 connectionsRight parcelsParacentral 116.6% $+26.6\%$ 18.569 <0.0 Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 Medial-orbito- 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 FrontalRostral anterior 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 Rostral anterior 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 Cingulate112.4\% $+22.4\%$ 7.494 0.00 Lateral-orbito- 112.4% $+22.4\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+7.1\%$ 6.306 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+13.7\%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcels 2% -12.8% 15.744 <0.025 Posterior 77.2% -12.8% 10.147 0.0025 Cuneus 73.2% -16.8% 10.147 0.0025 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+25.6\%$ 17.666 0.0025	Hemisphere	-			
connections Right parcels Paracentral 116.6 % $+ 26.6 \%$ 18.569 <0.0 Medial-orbito- 80.7 % $- 9.3 \%$ 12.595 0.00 Medial-orbito- 80.7 % $- 9.3 \%$ 12.595 0.00 frontal Rostral anterior 63.3% $- 26.7\%$ 9.722 0.00 cingulate 112.4 % $+ 22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 Lateral-orbito- 112.4 % $+ 22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 frontal 96.2 % $+ 6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+ 7.1 \%$ 6.306 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+ 13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+ 13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcels Posterior 77.2% $- 12.8\%$ 15.744 < 0.00 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+ 25.6 \%$ 17.666 0.00	Inter limbic	79.4 %	- 10.6 %	6.363	0.015*
Right parcelsParacentral 116.6% $+ 26.6\%$ 18.569 <0.0 Medial-orbito- 80.7% $- 9.3\%$ 12.595 0.00 frontal $Rostral anterior$ 63.3% $- 26.7\%$ 9.722 0.00 Rostral anterior 63.3% $- 26.7\%$ 9.722 0.00 cingulate $Lateral-orbito 112.4\%$ $+ 22.4\%$ 7.494 0.00 Lateral-orbito- 112.4% $+ 22.4\%$ 7.494 0.00 frontal $Rostral-middle 97.1\%$ $+ 6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+ 7.1\%$ 6.306 0.01 frontal 103.7% $+ 13.7\%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $- 12.8\%$ 15.744 <0.00 cingulate 20% $- 16.8\%$ 10.147 0.00 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+ 25.6\%$ 17.666 0.00	connections				
Paracentral 116.6% $+ 26.6\%$ 18.569 < 0.0 Medial-orbito- 80.7% $- 9.3\%$ 12.595 0.00 frontal $Rostral anterior$ 63.3% $- 26.7\%$ 9.722 0.00 cingulate $Lateral-orbito 112.4\%$ $+ 22.4\%$ 7.494 0.00 Lateral-orbito- 112.4% $+ 22.4\%$ 6.690 0.01 Inferior parietal 96.2% $+ 6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+ 7.1\%$ 6.306 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+ 13.7\%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+ 13.7\%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcels 77.2% $- 12.8\%$ 15.744 <0.00 Posterior 73.2% $- 16.8\%$ 10.147 0.00 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+ 25.6\%$ 17.666 0.00	Right parcels				
Medial-orbito- frontal 80.7% -9.3% 12.595 0.00 Rostral anterior cingulate 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 Lateral-orbito- frontal 112.4% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 Inferior parietal Rostral-middle- 96.2% $+6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- Pars orbitalis 97.1% $+7.1 \%$ 6.306 0.01 Pars orbitalis Posterior 103.7% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcels 77.2% -12.8% 15.744 <0.00 Posterior Cuneus 73.2% -16.8% 10.147 0.00 Parahippocampal Posterior 115.6% $+25.6 \%$ 17.666 0.00	Paracentral	116.6 %	+ 26.6 %	18.569	<0.001**
frontal Rostral anterior 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 cingulate Lateral-orbito- 112.4% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 Lateral-orbito- 112.4% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 frontal Inferior parietal 96.2% $+6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+7.1 \%$ 6.306 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcels 77.2% -12.8% 15.744 <0.00 Posterior 77.2% -16.8% 10.147 0.00 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+25.6 \%$ 17.666 0.00	Medial-orbito-	80.7 %	- 9.3 %	12.595	0.001*
Rostral anterior 63.3% -26.7% 9.722 0.00 cingulateLateral-orbito- 112.4% $+22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 frontalInferior parietal 96.2% $+6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+7.1 \%$ 6.306 0.01 frontalPars orbitalis 103.7% $+13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcelsPosterior 77.2% -12.8% 15.744 <0.00 Cuneus 73.2% -16.8% 10.147 0.00 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+25.6 \%$ 17.666 0.00	frontal				
cingulateLateral-orbito- 112.4% $+ 22.4 \%$ 7.494 0.00 frontalInferior parietal 96.2% $+ 6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+ 7.1 \%$ 6.306 0.01 frontalPars orbitalis 103.7% $+ 13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcelsPosterior 77.2% $- 12.8\%$ 15.744 <0.0000 Cuneus 73.2% $- 16.8 \%$ 10.147 0.0000 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+ 25.6 \%$ 17.666 0.0000	Rostral anterior	63.3 %	- 26.7%	9.722	0.003*
Lateral-orbito- 112.4% $+22.4\%$ 7.494 0.00 frontalInferior parietal 96.2% $+6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+7.1\%$ 6.306 0.01 frontalPars orbitalis 103.7% $+13.7\%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcelsPosterior 77.2% -12.8% 15.744 <0.025 Cuneus 73.2% -16.8% 10.147 0.0026 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+25.6\%$ 17.666 0.0026	cingulate				
trontalInferior parietal 96.2% $+ 6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+ 7.1 \%$ 6.306 0.01 frontal 103.7% $+ 13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+ 13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcelsPosterior 77.2% $- 12.8\%$ 15.744 <0.025 Cuneus 73.2% $- 16.8 \%$ 10.147 0.0025 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+ 25.6 \%$ 17.666 0.0025	Lateral-orbito-	112.4 %	+ 22.4 %	7.494	0.008*
Inferior parietal 96.2% $+ 6.2\%$ 6.690 0.01 Rostral-middle- 97.1% $+ 7.1\%$ 6.306 0.01 frontal 103.7% $+ 13.7\%$ 6.167 0.01 Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+ 13.7\%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcels 77.2% $- 12.8\%$ 15.744 <0.023 Posterior 77.2% $- 16.8\%$ 10.147 0.002 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+ 25.6\%$ 17.666 0.002	frontal			((00	0.010
Rostrai-middle- 97.1% $+7.1\%$ 6.306 0.01 frontalPars orbitalis 103.7% $+13.7\%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcelsPosterior 77.2% -12.8% 15.744 <0.0 cingulateCuneus 73.2% -16.8% 10.147 0.00 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+25.6\%$ 17.666 0.00	Inferior parietal	96.2 %	+6.2%	6.690	0.012
Pars orbitalis 103.7% $+ 13.7 \%$ 6.167 0.01 Left parcelsPosterior 77.2% $- 12.8\%$ 15.744 <0.0 cingulateCuneus 73.2% $- 16.8 \%$ 10.147 0.00 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+ 25.6 \%$ 17.666 0.00	Kostral-middle-	97.1%	+ /.1 %	6.306	0.015*
Left parcels 103.7% $+13.7\%$ 0.107 0.017 Left parcelsPosterior 77.2% -12.8% 15.744 <0.007 cingulateCuneus 73.2% -16.8% 10.147 0.007 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+25.6\%$ 17.666 0.007 Vi libric 2020 2021 0.007	Ironial Dara arbitalia	102 7 9/	$\pm 12.7.0/$	6 167	0.016*
Left parcelsPosterior 77.2% -12.8% 15.744 <0.0 cingulateCuneus 73.2% -16.8% 10.147 0.00 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+25.6 \%$ 17.666 0.00 Vi 10.141 2000 1000 0.00		103.7 70	13.7 /0	0.107	0.010
Posterior 77.2% -12.8% 15.744 <0.0 cingulateCuneus 73.2% -16.8% 10.147 0.00 Parahippocampal 115.6% $+ 25.6 \%$ 17.666 0.00 0.01			10.00/	15 7 4 4	-0.001***
Cuneus 73.2% - 16.8 %10.1470.00Parahippocampal115.6 %+ 25.6 %17.6660.00Vi 10 4- 100 %- 100 %- 0.010.01	Posterior	//.2 %	- 12.8%	15.744	<0.001**
Currents 73.2% - 16.8\%10.1470.00Parahippocampal115.6\%+ 25.6\%17.6660.00Vi 10.410.0010000.00	cingulate	72 2 0/	16.0.0/	10 147	0.002*
$\frac{1000}{100} = \frac{1000}{100} = 10$	Cuneus	/ 5 .2 % 115 6 0/	- 10.8 %	10.14/	0.002*
V_{11} (100) V_{10}	raranippocampal	113.0 % 200/	+ 23.0 %	1/.000	0.008*
$\frac{11}{100} - \frac{10}{10} - 1$	Precureus	0070 75 60/2	-1070 - 11 1 0/-	7.001 6.168	0.011
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Isthmussingulate	87 0 %	- 14.4 /0 _ 7 1 0/2	1 281	0.010

698 significant with FDR correction and ** significant with Bonferroni correction)

699

View publication stats